

### **REMARKS**

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in-person interview held on August 13. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Non-Final Office Action, mailed June 13, 2008, considered claims 1-63. Claims 1-63 were rejected under 35. U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugzilla (<http://web.archive.org/web/20020202141951/bugzilla.org/about.html> (Feb. 2, 2002)) hereinafter *Bugzilla*,<sup>1</sup>

By this amendment claims 1-5, 8, 13-15, 20-22, 26, 28-31, 34-41, 46-48, 51 and 53-60 have been amended and new claims 64-72 have been added.<sup>2</sup> Claims 6-7, 9-11, 19, 50, 62 and 63 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 8, 12-18, 20-49, 51-61 and 64-72 are pending, of which claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to coordinating communication between clients in order to assist in inter-team cooperation for accomplishing a collaborative goal. For example, claim 1 defines analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of client computing systems. Next, claim 1 defines determining that a first team of one or more users is responsible for proper implementation of the step, the course of steps including at least a first step for which the first team is determined to be responsible, and a second, subsequent step for which a second, different team is determined to be responsible, the second team including at least one member that is not a member of the first team.

Claim 1 further defines for the first step in the course of steps, presenting to at least a representative user of the first team a first dynamically generated, customized user interface, the

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the amendments to the claims and new claims is found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0044], [0050], [0051], [0053], [0054], [0059] and Figures 2, 4 and 6-8.

first user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed. Next, claim 1 defines automatically notifying at least a representative user of the second team the first step has been completed. Lastly, claim 1 defines presenting to at least a representative user of the second team a second dynamically generated, customized user interface, the second user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the second, subsequent step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to an updated current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed.

Claim 22 is a computer program product claim generally corresponding to claim 1. Claim 26 is a method claim similar to claim 1 where the server computing system coordinates communication between clients in order to generate corrective software that resolves a software performance deviation. Claim 48 is a computer program product claim generally corresponding to claim 26. Claim 60 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes functional language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

### **35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections**

As discussed during the interview, *Bugzilla* describes a defect tracking system (i.e. a bug-tracking system) that allows multiple software developers to keep track of outstanding bugs and track progress on the bug fixes. *Bugzilla* allows a software program such as a computer game to be divided into various components, where each component is overseen by a different programmer. For example, the software program may have a "UI" component, an "API" component, a "sound system" component and others. Components are often divided according to the natural divisions of responsibility among a company or development team (p. 34, pars. 1 & 2). Each component has an owner and, optionally, a quality assurance contact. When new bugs are created or when bugs are changed, the component owner and quality assurance contacts can receive email updates informing them of the changes. *Bugzilla* further allows configuration of a

shadow database which allows users to read a shadow copy of bugs that are being written to (and are thus locked) by other users.

However, while *Bugzilla* describes a bug-tracking system that allows componentization of various program features, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest a server computing system analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of client computing systems, as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1. Furthermore, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest a server computing system presenting to at least a representative user of the first team a first dynamically generated, customized user interface, the first user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed, as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1. *Bugzilla* does not mention generating customized user interfaces, nor does it mention generating such interfaces in response to a determination of steps that are to be taken in the completion of a collaborative goal.

Accordingly, *Bugzilla* fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 as recited. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 22, 26, 48 and 60 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Although each of the dependent claims patentably define over the prior art of record for the same reasons as their corresponding base claims, many of the dependent claims also independently distinguish over the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the first step in the course of steps comprises a plurality of substeps configured for processing in parallel, as recited in claim 4.

### **35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections**

Claims 1-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Independent claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60 have been amended to more clearly define which aspects of the invention are being claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-63 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Independent claims 1, 22, 26, 48 and 60 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1-63 be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections**

Claims 1-21, 26-47 and 60-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1, 26 and 60 have been amended to more clearly describe who is performing the methods and how the methods are performed. Moreover, Applicants submit that amended claim language causes claims 1-21, 26-47 and 60-63 to recite a tangible embodiment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 1-21, 26-47 and 60-63 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
GREGORY R. LUNT  
Registration No. 57,354  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

RDN:GRL:cj  
1902347\_1.DOC